

29. (Amended) Δ [The] method for manufacturing reflective-type liquid crystal display device, comprising:

providing first and second substrates;

providing a liquid crystal layer between the first and second substrates;

forming a reflective electrode having an opaque metal and being a surface with convex portions over the first substrate;

providing at least one uniaxial optical compensation film over the second substrate;

forming a first alignment layer having a plurality of alignment directions over the first substrate; and

forming a second alignment layer over the second substrate.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Currently, claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-39 are pending.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,455) in view of Toko (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,459). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Toko.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 29, as amended, disclose first and second substrates and "a reflective electrode over the first substrate, said reflective electrode having an opaque metal and being a surface with convex portions". Applicant submits that the changes incorporated in the amendment of claims 1, 8, 14 and 29 is supported by the Specification.

The rejection of claims 1, 8, 14 and 29 should be withdrawn because Sugiyama et al. fails to disclose a reflective electrode (over a substrate) having an opaque metal and being a surface with convex portions" as recited in the claims. By contrast, Sugiyama et al. discloses line-shaped electrodes formed on two glass substrates (col. 3, lines 60-61). Sugiyama et al. does not indicate or suggests that any of the electrodes is "a surface with convex portions". Further, Sugiyama et al. also fails to indicate or suggest that the electrodes have an opaque metal. By contrast, Sugiyama et al. discloses transparent electrodes (see col.4, line 5). Because the line-shaped, transparent electrodes of Sugiyama et al. clearly differ from the reflective electrode "having an opaque metal and being a surface with convex portions" recited in claims 1, 8, 14 and 29, Sugiyama et al. fails to teach or suggest the present invention.

Applicant submits that Toko fails to cure the deficiencies of Sugiyama et al. because Toko also fails to disclose a reflective electrode "having an opaque metal and being a surface with convex portions". Toko is silent with respect to the shape, composition and translucence (or lack thereof) of the disclosed electrodes. Therefore, Toko also fails to teach or suggest the present invention as defined in claims 1, 8, 14 and 29.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 8, 14 and 29 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Sugiyama et al. and Toko, and therefore should be allowed. Consequently, claims 3-4 and 6-7, 9-13, 15-28, and 30-39 as being dependent upon claims 1, 8, 14 and 29 respectively, should also be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: Walter I. Sutcliffe Reg. No. 24,914
for Andrew Chanho Sonu
Reg. No. 33,457

Dated: August 19, 1999

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
202-408-4000